

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated January 25, 2007. Claims 1-36 and 38-46 are pending. Claim 37 was cancelled without prejudice. Claims 4, 9, 25, and 36 have been amended. Claims 44-46 are new. New matter has not been added with the new claims and the amendments to the claims and the specification. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

Objections to the Specification

The Specification on page 2, line 17 was objected to for an informality. The Specification has been amended to address the concerns of the Office Action.

The Specification was also objected to for including embedded hyperlinks. The Office Action stated that the *Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP)* §608.01 required deletion of the hyperlinks. However, the *MPEP* states that:

Where the hyperlinks and/or other forms of browser-executable codes themselves rather than the contents of the site to which the hyperlinks are directed are part of applicant's invention and it is necessary to have them included in the patent application in order to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and applicant does not intend to have these hyperlinks be active links, examiners should not object to these hyperlinks. § 608.01 VII.

The Application is entitled "IDENTIFYING URL TARGET HOSTNAMES" and claim 1, for example, recites "[a] method for displaying a uniform resource locator (URL)." Thus, since the application is directed to hyperlinks and the applicant does not intend to have these hyperlinks active, Applicant requests removal of the objection to the hyperlinks in the Specification.

Section 101 Rejections

Claims 25-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Office Action states that claims 25-34 were rejected because claims 18-33 are not

limited to tangible embodiments. Applicant assumes that the reference to claims 18-33 was intended as a reference to claims 25-34.

Claim 25 recites “[a]n article comprising a machine-readable medium storing instructions, the instructions operable to cause one or more processors to perform operations comprising...” The *Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP)* states that “[w]hen functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized.” § 2106.01, page 2100-17, col. 1, para. 2 (8th ed. Aug. 2001, latest rev. Aug. 2006). Thus, since claim 25 comprises an article comprising machine-readable medium that stores instructions, it is statutory.

In addition, the claims are not directed to non-tangible embodiments. The *MPEP* states that “the focus is not on whether the steps taken to achieve a particular result are useful, tangible, and concrete, but rather on whether the final result achieved by the claimed invention is ‘useful, tangible, and concrete.’” § 2106.01, page 2100-12, col. 1, para. 1 (8th ed. Aug. 2001, latest rev. Aug. 2006). Applicant submits that the claims achieve a final result that is tangible. The *MPEP* states that the opposite of tangible is abstract. *MPEP* §2106.01, page 2100-12, col. 2, para. 2 (8th ed. Aug. 2001, latest rev. Aug. 2006). The claims do not achieve an abstract result but rather the tangible result of display of a warning message related to the hostname component of the URL. As stated in the Applicant’s Specification:

By alerting users to the true hostname component of a URL, it is possible to substantially reduce the chances of a user being spoofed into thinking she is at a web site that is different than what the user believed it to be. Users can be alerted using a warning message and/or by displaying a URL with a hostname component visually distinguished from other components of the URL (Applicant’s Specification, page 1, lines 21-25).

Thus, the claims produce tangible results and are directed to statutory subject matter.

Section 112 Rejections

Claims 4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims have been amended to address the concerns expressed in the Office Action.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 36, 40, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,136,849 to Patrick ("Patrick"). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over the cited art.

Claim 36 recites "determining whether the URL is suspicious based on an analysis of the hostname component and the other components." The Patrick reference teaches a method of indicating that a link in a web document is to an external link (Patrick, column 2, lines 9-11). The Patrick reference does not teach determining whether a URL is suspicious based on an analysis of a hostname component and other components. Accordingly, claim 36 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick and U.S. Patent No. 5,961,591, to Jones et al. ("Jones"). Claims 37 has been cancelled. Claim 38 depends on claim 36, which recites "determining whether the URL is suspicious based on an analysis of the hostname component and the other components." For at least the reasons mentioned in connection with claim 36, the Patrick reference does not teach at least this feature. The Jones reference also fails to teach determining whether a URL is suspicious based on an analysis of a hostname component and other components. Instead, the Jones reference teaches obtaining ratings for requested webpages from partially-downloaded contents of the requested web page or from a ratings bureau (Jones, column 6, lines 21-36). Accordingly, claim 36 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 1-8, 10, 12-15, 18-28, 32-35, 39, 41 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Patrick in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/40189693 to Kenig ("Kenig"). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over the cited art.

Claim 1 recites "visually distinguishing the hostname component of the URL from other components of the URL." The Office Action states that the Patrick reference teaches this limitation in Figures 1a-1c and column 3, lines 23-49; however, the Patrick reference teaches that visual indications or adornments are applied to external links (Patrick, column 3, lines 5-6). The Patrick reference does not teach visually distinguishing the hostname component of the URL from other components of the URL. In addition, the Kenig reference fails to rectify the deficiencies of the Patrick reference. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Independent claims 16, 25, and 35 recite limitations similar to claim 1. In particular claims 16 and 25 recite "'visually distinguishing the hostname component of the URL from other components of the URL'" and claim 35 recites "means for visually distinguishing the hostname component of the URL from other components of the URL." Accordingly, for at least the reasons mentioned in connection with claim 1, claim 16, 25, and 35 and their corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 39, 41 and 42 depend on claim 36 which recites "determining whether the URL is suspicious based on an analysis of the hostname component and the other components." For at least the reasons previously mentioned, the Patrick reference fails to teach this feature. The Kenig reference also fails to rectify the deficiencies of the Patrick reference. Accordingly, claim 36 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 16-17 and 29-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick, Kenig, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0169685 to Kubala ("Kubala").

Claims 16-17 depend on claim 1 which recites "visually distinguishing the hostname component of the URL from other components of the URL." For at least the reasons previously

mentioned in connection with claim 1, the Patrick reference and the Kenig reference do not teach visually distinguishing the hostname component of the URL from other components of the URL. In addition, the Kubala reference fails to rectify the deficiencies of the Patrick and the Kenig references. The Kubala reference teaches programming a web page to display a permission dialog box, when a user selects a hyperlink text, instead of automatically retrieving a target web page (Kubala, page 2, paragraph 0025). Thus, the Kubala reference does not teach visually distinguishing the hostname component of the URL from other components of the URL. Accordingly, claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 29-30 depend on claim 25, which includes similar limitations to claim 1. In particular claim 25 recites “visually distinguishing the hostname component of the URL from other components of the URL.” Accordingly, for at least the reasons mentioned in connection with claim 1, claims 25 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

A fee authorization has been submitted for the additional claims fee. If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 24, 2007

/Elizabeth Philip Dahm/

Elizabeth Philip Dahm

Reg. No. 51,352

PTO Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1717 Main Street, Suite 5000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 760-6119
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091

90216779.doc